

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified application is respectfully requested.

Claims 16 been amended to correct an inadvertent deletion.

Claims 11 and 16 have been rejected as anticipated by Williams et al. The Williams et al. patent does not disclose or suggest the recited construction of the second telescoping member.

Claims 12, 13, 23, and 24 were rejected as unpatentable over Williams et al. in view of Walkden. Neither patent discloses or suggests a telescoping member not attached to a vehicle that has the recited construction.

Claims 15, 26, and 27 were rejected as unpatentable over Williams et al. in view of Ringdahl et al. The Ringdahl patent does not disclose motion along two orthogonal axes. How can the patent teach a single switch for such?

Applicants claim a single switch for controlling motion. The Examiner asserts that "it would have been obvious ... to provide ... a double throw switch and a microprocessor in order to control the device with a minimum of switches." It is not clear why the Examiner thinks the switch must be double throw. Such is not recited.

The Ringdahl et al. patent overcomes none of the deficiencies noted above in the Williams et al. patent.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that claims 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 23, 24, 26, and 27 are in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul F. Wille  
Reg. No. 25,274  
Attorney for Applicants

6407 East Clinton St.  
Scottsdale, AZ 85254  
tel. (602) 549-9088